

<b>Interview Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/084,441	LIN, J. T
	Examiner Michael Peffley	Art Unit 3739

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Michael Peffley. (3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) William Bollman. (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 11 April 2001.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.  
If Yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 53 and 69.

Identification of prior art discussed: N/A.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview(if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION **MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW**. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The examiner agreed that not all claims (i.e. claim 69) recited a laser having an energy level of less than 10 mJ per pulse as stated in the Reasons for Allowance of Paper No. 26, and further that the specific energy level was not a limitation which should be required in the claims. However, in further reviewing the file history, the examiner determined that claim 1 of the '679 patent had been amended to include recitation of a "low power laser", and that applicant asserted this limitation as a feature which distinguished over the prior art. Therefore, the examiner maintains that a recitation of a "low power laser" must be present in the instant application claims to avoid recapture. Recitation of a laser having an energy of around 10 mJ or lower (as in many of the other claims) is deemed to be a recitation of a "low power laser". Applicant has agreed to amend claim 69 (see attached Examiner's Amendment) to add the limitation of a "low power laser".

RECEIVED  
U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
JULY 14 2003